REMARKS

This communication is a full and timely response to the Office Action dated February 3, 2010. Claims 4-7, 9-16, and 20-36 remain pending. By this communication, claims 1-3, 8, and 17-19 are canceled without prejudice or disclaimer to the underlying subject matter, and claims 34-36 are added.

Applicants appreciate the Examiner's grant of an interview on April 27, 2010 to discuss the merits of the instant application. During the interview, the parties discussed the invention encompassed by claim 1 in view of the teachings of the prior art of record. No agreement regarding distinctions between the claims and the applied art was reached.

As noted above, claims 34-36 are newly added. Applicants believe that these claims are distinguishable over the prior art of record for the reasons discussed in detail below.

On page 2 of the Office Action, claims 1-33 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by *Glanzer et al* (U.S. Patent No. 6,424,872). Applicants have canceled previous independent claims 1 and 17 in favor of independent claims 34 and 35, respectively. Therefore, the rejection of claims 1 and 17 is moot. Regarding new claims 34 and 35, *Glanzer* fails to disclose or suggest the respective features therein.

As provided in a previous response, exemplary embodiments described in Applicants' disclosure are directed to providing and installing device-specific functionalities and information for field devices arranged in a distributed system. Device specific components interact with at least two functional units. The functional units are configured to store device information used to integrate the field devices

into the distributed system. A controller acquires and installs data specific to each device and the functional units that interact with the devices. Based on the install the controller includes means for interacting with each field device in the arrangement. In other words, the controller can perform an automatic install of device data so that the controller can interact with each device in an arrangement of field devices.

Applicants' claims and particularly independent claims 34 and 35 broadly encompass the foregoing features.

Claim 34 recites the following:

> A system for controlling a distributed system comprising:
> an arrangement of plural field devices, wherein each field device is associated with a device-specific component and at least one functional unit;
> memory that stores device-specific data of each device-specific component and the at least one functional unit; and
> a controller that communicates with the memory to acquire and install the device specific data, wherein the controller includes means for interacting with each field device based on the installed device-specific data.

Claim 35 recites

> A method for configuring a distributed system, wherein the distributed system includes memory, an arrangement of field devices, and a controller, the method comprising:
> storing device-specific data in the memory;
> installing the device-specific data in the controller; and
> producing, at the controller, device-specific components for the arrangement of field devices based on the installed device specific data.

As discussed in a previous response, *Glanzer* discloses a block control system that includes plural field devices that incorporate a physical layer, communication stack, and user layer, with the field devices being connected by a

bus. The communications stack is described as facilitating data exchanges and message exchanges. Fig. 3 illustrates various components of a field device that control data exchanges for that device.

In particular, the Examiner asserts that the described link active scheduler 100 of *Glanzer* installs device-specific information. However, under closer scrutiny, the link active scheduler is described as coordinating the timing of communication by issuing compel data messages at schedule time (col. 6, lines 27-29), maintaining a "live list" of active field devices on the network (col. 6, lines 4-6), and broadcasting changes in the "live list" over the network (col. 6, lines 21-24). One of ordinary skill would understand that none of these features when viewed individually or collectively amount to installing device specific data as recited in the claims.

Based on the guidance provided therein, one of ordinary skill would therefore find that *Glanzer* fails to disclose or suggest at least a controller that communicates with the memory to acquire and install the device specific data, wherein the controller includes means for interacting with each field device based on the installed device-specific data, as recited in claim 34; and producing, at the controller, at least one device-specific component for the arrangement of field devices based on the installed device-specific data, as recited in claim 35. Rather at best, *Glanzer* discloses the transfer of data between field devices and a scheduler over a communication bus. Thus, *Glanzer* fails to anticipate claims 34 and 35 and withdrawal of this rejection is deemed appropriate.

In addition to the features recited in independent claims 34 and 35, Applicants submit that *Glanzer* also fails to disclose or suggest the additional features recited in each claim (4-7 and 9-16) depending from claim 1, and each claim 20-33 and 36 depending from claim 35. Hence, claims 4-7, 9-16, 20-33, and 36 are distinguishable over and thus not anticipated by *Glanzer*.

Conclusion

Based on the foregoing remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 4-7, 9-16, and 20-36 are allowable and this application is in condition for allowance. In the event any issues adverse to allowance of this application remain, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned to advance prosecution.

Respectfully submitted,

BUCHANAN INGERSOLL & ROONEY PC

Date: <u>May 3, 2010</u>　　　　By: 　<u>/Shawn B Cage/</u>　　
　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　Shawn B. Cage
　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　Registration No. 51522

Customer No. 21839
703 836 6620